

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-45 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 17-21 are independent claims. Claims 1 and 17-21 are amended. Claim 7 is canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 – Ando et al.

Claims 1-6 and 8-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,054,545 (Ando). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose every element of the claim (MPEP § 2131). Applicants note claim 1 is drawn to a computer-readable medium and is amended to further clarify the specifics of the navigation area and the data area of the computer-readable medium. The navigation area stores at least 1) “first and second clip information files”; 2) “the first clip information file including a first entry point map” wherein the first entry point map includes at least one entry point pointing to a still picture; 3) “the second clip information file including a second entry point map” wherein the second entry point map includes at least one entry point pointing to audio data; and 4) “the clip information file is separate from the playlist file.” Applicants submit that at least these features patentably distinguish claim 1 over the cited references.

The Examiner appears to allege that row(c) of FIG. 7 discloses a single unified EP map with entry points for both audio and picture data (see page 3 of the Office Action). Ando, therefore, does not recite a second EP map. As amended, claim 1 recites “a navigation area storing at least one playlist file, first and second clip information files...the first clip information file including a first entry point map...and the second clip information file including a second entry point map.” The Applicants assert that Ando does not anticipate claim 1 because Ando does not disclose a second EP map.

Regardless of whether or not row (c) of FIG. 7 discloses several EP maps or one EP map, claim 1 is still not anticipated because Ando does not teach “the first clip information file including the first entry point map, the first entry point map including at least one entry point pointing to the still picture... and the second clip information file including a second entry point map, the second entry point map including at least one entry point pointing to the audio data.” On its face, Ando does not appear to

teach “clip information files,” therefore, Ando does not disclose EP maps included in a clip information file. Furthermore, because Ando does not disclose clip information files, Ando does not disclose that “the clip information file are separate from the playlist file.” For at least these reasons, the Applicants submit that Ando does not anticipate claim 1.

For at least the reasons stated above, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 1, and all claims which depend thereon, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ando be withdrawn.

For similar reasons, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 17-21, and all claims which depend thereon, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ando be withdrawn.

Request to Make Next Office Action Non-final

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is **complex** or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the Applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2)

The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's analysis of Ando with regard to the present application. In the event the Examiner rejects the newly amended claims, the Applicants respectfully request a detailed explanation as to how Ando (or any other reference) either anticipates or renders obvious the features of the newly amended claims. Specifically, the Applicants request the Examiner explain how the reference(s) teach the claimed playlist, first and second clip information files, and entry point maps. Further, we request the Examiner show and explain how the prior art teaches the various interrelationships such as how the entry point maps are included in the respective clip information files and how the clip information files are separate from the play list files. The intent is not to burden the Examiner with a detailed Office Action but to provide the Applicants with a clear understanding of the Examiner's interpretation of the prior art. In the event the Examiner rejects the newly amended claims, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner make the next Office Action non-final to give the Applicants a fair opportunity to respond with new arguments and/or amendments.

Request for Clarification

On page 2 of Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Ando discloses two different EP maps in FIG. 7 (row c) where one entry point map points to the audio required for the track and the other entry point map points to still pictures required for that track. Later, the Examiner alleges that the Applicants disclose a similar entry point map "that may be unified into one and may be managed as one single entry point map." The Applicants are uncertain as to whether the Examiner is alleging that row (c) of FIG. 7 represents several EP maps or one unified map. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request clarification.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: Scott Elchert 55,149

Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Scott A. Elchert, Reg. No. 55,149
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/SAE/DMB/lo